

## Gwyneth Everson

---

**From:** Grenfell Tower Leaseholder's Association  
<grenfelleaseholdersassociation@hotmail.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 26 November 2019 23:02  
**To:** Andrew Brookes  
**Cc:** Gwyneth Everson  
**Subject:** FW: ISSUES AND CONCERNS AT GRENFELL TOWER  
**Attachments:** GRENFELL 30JUN-08DEC11.xlsx 2.xlsx; SKMBT\_C36011122114220.pdf;  
SKMBT\_C36011122210460.pdf

External email STOP THINK before you CLICK on links or OPEN attachments  
FYI- Shah

---

**From:** Keith Mott <grenfelleaseholdersassociation@hotmail.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 22 April 2012 20:31  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] Eddie daffarn [REDACTED] Judith  
Blakeman <cllr.blakeman@rbkc.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** ISSUES AND CONCERNS AT GRENFELL TOWER

Mr Robert Bryans  
Chairman  
Estate Management Board  
Lancaster West Estate  
Grenfell Tower  
London W11

06<sup>th</sup> April 2012  
Posted By Hand and Email

Dear Robert Bryans,

It was nice meeting you at the Lancaster West stakeholders meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2011 at EMB office. I would like to share some of our serious issues and concerns with you as Chair person of **EMB** in relation to Grenfell Tower. I also know that **LWEMB** existed before the K&CTMO. I have been living in this area for the past 25 years and some of the leaseholders have lived all their lives at LW. And I have seen how the Grenfell Tower has been reduced to something near a slum when neighbouring estates of other boroughs have regenerated their estates to 21<sup>st</sup> Century standard. What went wrong? Who was in charge of Estate office and estate officer and Estate office base at Grenfell Tower?

On behalf of GTLA we appreciate your assertion in the stakeholders meeting dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2011 in relation to the inadequate and dangerous heating and hot water system in Grenfell Tower. We have been raising these issues with the K&CTMO as a matter of priority for the past years. Due to these payments, residents of Grenfell Tower have been paying extortionately high rent and the service charges.

Minutes of Meeting references:

- 3.1 Residents were angry that the heating system is the original system and is over 30 years old; they feel it is inadequate and dangerous.

3.03 RB stated that loads of money has been spent on the heating system, new pumps/valves but it seems to have had little affect or no effect. He stated that there needs to be some genuine work done to rebalance the heating and it controls.

3.09 RB stated that a survey was carried out by the EMB Board and it showed that a lot of heat was being wasted from the chimney. This poses the question why are we wasting heat and not recycling?

We are the recognised Leaseholder's Association (GTLA) and under section 20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 as Amended by Landlord and Tenant Act 1987 and Commonhold and leasehold Reform Act 2002, the K&CTMO has a legal obligation to establish a strong working relation with GTLA. We have been liaising with the K&CTMO for almost three years and they know our position and the necessary improvements at Grenfell Tower.

The Chief Executive of the K&CTMO and the Assistant Director of the homeownership Mr Daniel Wood committed to having a strong working relationship with us and we wait to see how this develops in the very near future.

Please find enclosed recent correspondences with the council and the K&CTMO for your kind inspection. I have given the same bundle to our new Neighbourhood manager Ms Siobhan Rumble for her immediate and urgent action to put things right once for all without further delay.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Best Wishes

**Mr Tunde Awoderu**

The Vice Chairman

The Grenfell Tower Leaseholder's Association

Recent correspondences Enclosures:

1. Email response from Cllr Coleridge dated 27<sup>th</sup> February 2012 Subject: Grenfell Tower in dire need of Modernisation
2. Email responses from The Chief executive Of K&CTMO Mr Robert Black and the management. Lift Maintenance Agreement
3. Copy of the agenda raised by the GTLA for the Stakeholders Meetings dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2011. ( Issues and concerns)
4. Email to Siobhan Rumble dated 8<sup>th</sup> January 2012 for which we are yet to receive a reply. Subject: Window Cleaning and replacement at Grenfell Tower
5. Email to Siobhan Rumble dated 10<sup>th</sup> January 2012 for which we are yet to receive a reply. Subject: Station Walk

---

From: rblack@kctmo.org.uk

To: grenfellleaseholdersassociation@hotmail.co.uk

CC: cllr.blakeman@rbkc.gov.uk; laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] srumble@kctmo.org.uk; strobes@private-eye.co.uk; TComplaints@kctmo.org.uk;

[REDACTED] cllr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk; cllr.mason@rbkc.gov.uk; penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk;

leader@rbkc.gov.uk; maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk; derek.myers@rbkc.gov.uk; dwood@kctmo.org.uk

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2012 16:49:52 +0000

Subject: RE: Lift Maintenance Agreement



Dear Mr Awoderu,

Thank you for your email.

I have now had a chance to review your comments in respect of the response timeframes and alleged lack of response on this matter and I have reviewed the chain of correspondence and timeframes. This review shows that Daniel Wood ( Assistant Director, Home Ownership) provided a detailed response on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2012 and to provide assistance I have attached a copy for your reference.

My review has shown the timeline for this correspondence and from my records it is as follows:

Initial enquiry send to Mr Wood	11 <sup>th</sup> December 2011
Mr Wood's acknowledgement	13 <sup>th</sup> December 2011
Mr Wood's response	22 <sup>nd</sup> December 2011

The acknowledgement and response are all in accordance with our published service standards.

However, from your correspondence and that of other members of the Grenfell Tower Leasehold Association, it seems that it may well be beneficial for your association and my officers to meet to discuss any issues that you may have. I would therefore be grateful if you would confirm if you are happy for me to instruct Mr Wood to arrange a meeting, at the convenience of the association, with view to building a stronger working relationship.

I trust this addresses your enquiry and please don't hesitate to contact me should you have any further questions.


Robert  
**Robert Black**  
**Chief Executive**

t: [REDACTED] m: [REDACTED]



w: [www.kctmo.org.uk](http://www.kctmo.org.uk)

a: 346 Kensington High Street, London, W14 8NS

 Before printing, please think about the environment

---

**From:** Keith Mott [mailto:grenfelleaseholdersassociation@hotmail.co.uk]

**Sent:** 24 January 2012 22:51

**To:** Robert Black

**Cc:** Judith Blakeman; laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk; [REDACTED]; Eddie daffarn; Siobhan Rumble; strobes@private-eye.co.uk; (T) Complaints; [REDACTED] cllr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk; cllr.mason@rbkc.gov.uk; penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk; Merrick Cockell; maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk; Derek Myers

**Subject:** FW: Lift Maintenance Agreement

Dear Mr Black,

Further to your email dated 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2011, please find my forwarded email dated 11<sup>th</sup> December 2011. I wrote to your senior staff and have yet to receive a response. Your 10 days reply policy is repeatedly made a mockery out of. Credibility is something which the K&CTMO is severely lacking.

We require a response to our email very shortly, as action needs to be taken.

Yours Sincerely,

**Mr Tunde Awoderu**

The Vice Chairman

The Grenfell Tower Leaseholder's Association

---

From: [REDACTED]  
To: dwood@kctmo.org.uk  
CC: rblack@kctmo.org.uk; derek.myers@rbkc.gov.uk; leader@rbkc.gov.uk; maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk; [REDACTED] sjevans@kctmo.org.uk; staffordt@parliament.uk; [REDACTED] adairo@kctmo.org.uk; laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk; [REDACTED] tcomplaints@kctmo.org.uk; jane.trethewey@rbkc.gov.uk; penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk; aparkes@kctmo.org.uk; peter.bradbury@rbkc.gov.uk; cllr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk  
Subject: RE: Lift Maintenance Agreement  
Date: Sun, 11 Dec 2011 19:48:02 +0000

Dear Mr Wood,

Further to your email dated 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 to Mr Mott in relation to lift maintenance. Whilst we acknowledge your apology, a 5 month delayed response makes a mockery of your 10 days reply policy. It also carries less weight considering that Mr Pretorious himself has not conveyed his apologies and I find it very incompetent.

The responses you gave in the past in your letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> August, 21<sup>st</sup> September and 27<sup>th</sup> October 2010 were out of touch. There was no relation between what was actually going on and what you suggested. The residents of the Grenfell Tower continue to express their discontent with the sub-standard services day in and day out. Worst of all, poor decision making in choosing contractors, has in this instance meant that the residents have to pay the costs of repairs and renewals. For the longer run, it will cost us double the amount it should have. It is a clear indication of the TMO making money by recharging the leaseholders and the tenant after issuing a tender.

The K&CTMO evidently have a mandate to protect the council's interest. Their whole sale approach in attempted to forfeit leases and put residents on the street is appalling under the current economics climate. In the process K&CTMO appoints lawyers who make money as does the TMO. Looks like you have created quite the business model as a tenant led organisation. You have attempted to maximise such revenue streams whilst providing the bare minimum and in many cases an inadequate level of services for the residents of Grenfell Tower.

You have spent almost £700K of council's, tenants' and the leaseholders' money to replace the two lifts. Please can you outline how much was management fees, admin fees and sundry fees? How did you work out management fees for the lifts replacement? We are shocked that despite it costing almost £700K and your appointed contractor only provided you a standard 1 year guarantee period from the completion of the last lift. You have failed to realise that nowadays if you buy a TV from a reputable electronics shop, they provide a 5 years warranty.

Everytime there is a call out, there is a charge of £90.00, on top of the maintenance contract of over £3500 and parts and labour cost gets distributed at the end of the financial year through rent and service charges. So in that process money is made out of the misery of the residents of Grenfell Tower. I do not have to go back months, only last week from Friday until Monday (2, 3, 4, 5<sup>th</sup> December 2011) one lift was out of order due to a component failure and the other lift was malfunctioning. If you think my assertion is wrong, please go and ask every resident of Grenfell Tower. I also do not think you are the appropriate person to agree or disagree with our statement that the lifts are malfunctioning like they are 20 years old. We are the residents living in the building, if you ask what the people at Grenfell Tower think, they will back our statement.



Also to prove my point, please find the attached example of photographic evidences of how many times the lift was out of services and if require more evidence please let me know and yet we are paying for the services on top of hefty major work bills for the leaseholders and rent increments for the tenants. Do you seriously believe that only 5 years old lifts should malfunction so frequently? This is saying nothing about the rubbish which is habitually left in the lifts which makes visitors and residents alike feel that Grenfell Tower is a neglected building in the borough, which evidently it is. Also do you seriously believe that the rent and service charges the residents of Grenfell Tower are paying are reasonably incurred and have been so for the past decades? If so, to back up your claim, please invite an independent body to look into the whole saga in an impartial manner.

Let me remind you that we are the Grenfell Tower Leaseholder Association as a recognised Leaseholders Association, we have the right to request information and you have the obligation to provide such important information within 21 days. Please provide breakdown costs to replace the two lifts without further delay.

Yours Sincerely,

**Mr Tunde Awoderu**  
Vice Chairman  
The Grenfell Tower Leaseholder's Association

---

From: dwood@kctmo.org.uk  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Lift Maintenance Agreement  
Date: Mon, 21 Nov 2011 14:38:37 +0000

Dear Mr Mott,

Further to your observation dated 27<sup>th</sup> June 2011, in relation to the Proposed Qualifying Long Term Agreement for Lifts Maintenance. It has come to my attention that whilst this was acknowledged by Mr Pretorius on the 27<sup>th</sup> June, you have not received a formal response.

I would firstly like to unreservedly apologise for this oversight and trust that the following addresses the point that you raised:

As you have correctly stated, the two lifts at Grenfell Tower were replaced five years ago but I would have to disagree with your assertion that the lifts are "malfunctioning like they are 20 years old". Both myself and Anthony Parkes ( Director of Financial Services) have previously addressed various questions in respect of the lifts in our letters of 20<sup>th</sup> August 2010, 21<sup>st</sup> September 2010 and 27<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

I have noted and appreciate your comments in respect of the contractor who undertook the lift replacement, However, I have discussed this with our Senior Lift Engineer and he has advised that the contractor, Apex, provided a standard 1 year guarantee period from completion of the last lift which expired in April 2007. Latent defects would apply out of this period for component failures but that has not been the case.

The maintenance of the lifts is not the responsibility of the installers, save for where there is a latent defect and we have a responsibility to ensure the maintenance of all of the lifts across the borough.

I should also mention that this is the first stage of the consultation process and we expect to be issuing the second notice early next year. This will cover the costs and the tenders from the contractors, where you will again be able to submit any observations that you may have in respect of the proposal.

I trust this clarifies matters and would again like to apologise for the delay in responding to your observation.

Should you have any further enquires then please don't hesitate to contact me.

On a separate note, if there are any outstanding issues in respect of the recent water penetration problems then please let me know and I will ensure that they are addressed as a matter of urgency.

Kind regards,  
**Daniel Wood**  
Assistant Director, Home Ownership  
t: [REDACTED] m: [REDACTED]



w: [www.kctmo.org.uk](http://www.kctmo.org.uk)  
a: 292a Kensal Road, London, W10 5BE

---

This e-mail message has been scanned for Viruses and Content and cleared by **MailMarshal**

---

**DISCLAIMER:**

This E-mail and any files transmitted with are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the System Administrator. This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this email. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Kensington & Chelsea TMO Ltd. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Kensington & Chelsea TMO Ltd accepts no liability for any damage caused by any Virus transmitted by this email.

---

This e-mail message has been scanned for Viruses and Content and cleared by **MailMarshal**

---

**DISCLAIMER:**

This E-mail and any files transmitted with are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the System Administrator. This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this email. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Kensington & Chelsea TMO Ltd. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Kensington & Chelsea TMO Ltd accepts no liability for any damage caused by any Virus transmitted by this email.

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

From: [dwood@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:dwood@kctmo.org.uk)  
To: [REDACTED]  
CC: [rblack@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:rblack@kctmo.org.uk); [derek.myers@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:derek.myers@rbkc.gov.uk); [leader@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:leader@rbkc.gov.uk); [maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk](mailto:maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk); [REDACTED]; [sjevans@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:sjevans@kctmo.org.uk); [staffordt@parliament.uk](mailto:staffordt@parliament.uk); [REDACTED]; [adairo@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:adairo@kctmo.org.uk); [laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk); [REDACTED]; [TComplaints@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:TComplaints@kctmo.org.uk); [jane.trethewey@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:jane.trethewey@rbkc.gov.uk); [penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk); [aparkes@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:aparkes@kctmo.org.uk); [peter.bradbury@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:peter.bradbury@rbkc.gov.uk); [cllr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk)



Date: Thu, 22 Dec 2011 11:55:07 +0000  
Subject: RE: Lift Maintenance Agreement

Dear Mr Awoderu,

Further to your email of 11<sup>th</sup> December, I would firstly like to clarify the timeframes and response. I have had sight of various emails that imply that your enquires had neither been acknowledged or responded too.

I have attached my acknowledgement of 13<sup>th</sup> December, which confirms that a full response would be provided by 23<sup>rd</sup> December and trust that the following provides the requested clarity:

Attached you will find a summary of the latest breakdown figures.

Our Lift engineers are kept informed of the day to day occurrences by the caretakers and the Lancaster West estate office. The lift renewal contract was tendered in the correct manor and the successful contractor was Apex lifts. After installation and following the expiration of the 12 month defect liability period – please note that this is not comparable to a guarantee for a television, the lift servicing was added to the borough wide service contract.

The borough wide lift maintenance contract is in the process of being re-tendered and all contractors are going through a strict OJEU procurement process. We are looking at having the successful contractor in place by April 2012 but prior to the commencement of the contact we will be consulting further with all lessees'.

As requested I have attached a breakdown of the costs and final account documents for the lift renewal works (LHS 1884). The lift renewal contract included the renewal of 2 passenger lifts in Grenfell Tower and 1 hydraulic lift in the attached block, which was at the time, occupied by RBK&C Social Services, the total cost was £631.640.51.

The two passenger lifts were £482,979.08 plus 8.22% professional fee, and a 12.5%management fee.

Below is a link to the review of the management fee, which should provide the requested clarity:

<http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/howwegovern/keydecisions/decision.asp?DecisionID=2814>

The fully comprehensive service contract for 2 lifts amounts to £3530.16 per annum, and the responsive repair rates are as follows:

Hourly Rates:	1. 08.00 to 17.00	£57.55
	2.Nights (weekdays)	£68.32
	3.Saturdays	£68.32
	4.Sundays & Bank Holidays	£87.30
Fixed Rates:	1.Door Obstructions (days)	£63.13
	2. Obstructions (Nights)	£93.17
	3. Working on arrival (days)	£67.30
	4. Working on arrival (nights)	£93.17

Lift H91 was shutdown on Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> December at 02.30 following a water leak from the TMO plant in the roof area which spilled into the lift shaft ,it was reinstated on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> December, following the renewal of the car top equipment printed circuit boards, drying out all lift shaft equipment and pumping water from the lift pits.

The other lift, H90, was in service throughout this period and was monitored on a regular basis by service engineers to ensure that the lift service was maintained .

The budget price to renew the 5 and a half year old lifts ,would be £400,000, taking into consideration all the enabling works carried out when renewing these lifts in 2006. There is however, no reason to renew these lifts and we are satisfied that they are maintained to a good standard .

The cleaning of the lifts is part of the cleaning contract and is monitored on a regular basis by the caretakers. It should also be noted that we have a cleaning call back service, so should any residents feel that additional cleaning is warranted we will return – I have attached the details for your reference.

I have discussed your enquires with Robin Cahalarn (Senior Lift Engineer) and should you require any further information, Robin and I are more that happy to meet with you, at your convenience. If you think this would be beneficial then please let me have some provisional dates and times.

Robin has also confirmed that he has asked Independent Lifts (service contractor ) to carry out a quality audit at the earliest opportunity.

I trust this is of assistance and please let me know if there is anything else I can help with.

Kind regards,  
**Daniel Wood**  
**Assistant Director, Home Ownership**

t: [REDACTED] m: [REDACTED]



w: [www.kctmo.org.uk](http://www.kctmo.org.uk)  
a: 292a Kensal Road, London,W10 5BE

---

**From:** Daniel Wood  
**Sent:** 13 December 2011 13:43  
**To:** 'Keith Mott'  
**Cc:** Robert Black; Derek Myers; Merrick Cockell; maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk; Judith Blakeman; Sacha Jevans; staffordt@parliament.uk; Eddie daffarn; Adelola Dairo; laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk; [REDACTED] (T) Complaints; Jane Trethewey; penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk; Anthony Parkes; Peter Bradury; clr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk  
**Subject:** RE: Lift Maintenance Agreement

Dear Mr Awoderu,

Thank you for your email, I have noted your comments and will ensure that you have a full response no later than 23<sup>rd</sup> December.

I trust this is of assistance and please let me know if there is anything else I can help with.

Kind regards,  
**Daniel Wood**  
**Assistant Director, Home Ownership**

t: [REDACTED] m: [REDACTED]



w: [www.kctmo.org.uk](http://www.kctmo.org.uk)  
a: 292a Kensal Road, London,W10 5BE



**From:** grenfellleaseholdersassociation@hotmail.co.uk [mailto:grenfellleaseholdersassociation@hotmail.co.uk] **On Behalf Of** Keith Mott  
**Sent:** 11 December 2011 19:48  
**To:** Daniel Wood  
**Cc:** Robert Black; Derek Myers; Merrick Cockell; maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk; Judith Blakeman; Sacha Jevans; staffordt@parliament.uk; Eddie daffarn; Adelola Dairo; laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk; [REDACTED] (T) Complaints; Jane Trethewey; penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk; Anthony Parkes; Peter Bradury; cllr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk  
**Subject:** RE: Lift Maintenance Agreement

Dear Mr Wood,

Further to your email dated 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 to Mr Mott in relation to lift maintenance. Whilst we acknowledge your apology, a 5 month delayed response makes a mockery of your 10 days reply policy. It also carries less weight considering that Mr Pretorious himself has not conveyed his apologies and I find it very incompetent.

The responses you gave in the past in your letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> August, 21<sup>st</sup> September and 27<sup>th</sup> October 2010 were out of touch. There was no relation between what was actually going on and what you suggested. The residents of the Grenfell Tower continue to express their discontent with the sub-standard services day in and day out. Worst of all, poor decision making in choosing contractors, has in this instance meant that the residents have to pay the costs of repairs and renewals. For the longer run, it will cost us double the amount it should have. It is a clear indication of the TMO making money by recharging the leaseholders and the tenant after issuing a tender.

The K&CTMO evidently have a mandate to protect the council's interest. Their whole sale approach in attempted to forfeit leases and put residents on the street is appalling under the current economics climate. In the process K&CTMO appoints lawyers who make money as does the TMO. Looks like you have created quite the business model as a tenant led organisation. You have attempted to maximise such revenue streams whilst providing the bare minimum and in many cases an inadequate level of services for the residents of Grenfell Tower.

You have spent almost £700K of council's, tenants' and the leaseholders' money to replace the two lifts. Please can you outline how much was management fees, admin fees and sundry fees? How did you work out management fees for the lifts replacement? We are shocked that despite it costing almost £700K and your appointed contractor only provided you a standard 1 year guarantee period from the completion of the last lift. You have failed to realise that nowadays if you buy a TV from a reputable electronics shop, they provide a 5 years warranty.

Everytime there is a call out, there is a charge of £90.00, on top of the maintenance contract of over £3500 and parts and labour cost gets distributed at the end of the financial year through rent and service charges. So in that process money is made out of the misery of the residents of Grenfell Tower. I do not have to go back months, only last week from Friday until Monday (2, 3, 4, 5<sup>th</sup> December 2011) one lift was out of order due to a component failure and the other lift was malfunctioning. If you think my assertion is wrong, please go and ask every resident of Grenfell Tower. I also do not think you are the appropriate person to agree or disagree with our statement that the lifts are malfunctioning like they are 20 years old. We are the residents living in the building, if you ask what the people at Grenfell Tower think, they will back our statement.

Also to prove my point, please find the attached example of photographic evidences of how many times the lift was out of services and if require more evidence please let me know and yet we are paying for the services on top of hefty major work bills for the leaseholders and rent increments for the tenants. Do you seriously believe that only 5 years old lifts should malfunction so frequently? This is saying nothing about the rubbish which is habitually left in

the lifts which makes visitors and residents alike feel that Grenfell Tower is a neglected building in the borough, which evidently it is. Also do you seriously believe that the rent and service charges the residents of Grenfell Tower are paying are reasonably incurred and have been so for the past decades? If so, to back up your claim, please invite an independent body to look into the whole saga in an impartial manner.

Let me remind you that we are the Grenfell Tower Leaseholder Association as a recognised Leaseholders Association, we have the right to request information and you have the obligation to provide such important information within 21 days. Please provide breakdown costs to replace the two lifts without further delay.

Yours Sincerely,

**Mr Tunde Awoderu**  
Vice Chairman  
The Grenfell Tower Leaseholder's Association

---

From: dwood@kctmo.org.uk  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Lift Maintenance Agreement  
Date: Mon, 21 Nov 2011 14:38:37 +0000

Dear Mr Mott,

Further to your observation dated 27<sup>th</sup> June 2011, in relation to the Proposed Qualifying Long Term Agreement for Lifts Maintenance. It has come to my attention that whilst this was acknowledged by Mr Pretorius on the 27<sup>th</sup> June, you have not received a formal response.

I would firstly like to unreservedly apologise for this oversight and trust that the following addresses the point that you raised:

As you have correctly stated, the two lifts at Grenfell Tower were replaced five years ago but I would have to disagree with your assertion that the lifts are "malfunctioning like they are 20 years old". Both myself and Anthony Parkes ( Director of Financial Services) have previously addressed various questions in respect of the lifts in our letters of 20<sup>th</sup> August 2010, 21<sup>st</sup> September 2010 and 27<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

I have noted and appreciate your comments in respect of the contractor who undertook the lift replacement, However, I have discussed this with our Senior Lift Engineer and he has advised that the contractor, Apex, provided a standard 1 year guarantee period from completion of the last lift which expired in April 2007. Latent defects would apply out of this period for component failures but that has not been the case.

The maintenance of the lifts is not the responsibility of the installers, save for where there is a latent defect and we have a responsibility to ensure the maintenance of all of the lifts across the borough.

I should also mention that this is the first stage of the consultation process and we expect to be issuing the second notice early next year. This will cover the costs and the tenders from the contractors, where you will again be able to submit any observations that you may have in respect of the proposal.

I trust this clarifies matters and would again like to apologise for the delay in responding to your observation.

Should you have any further enquires then please don't hesitate to contact me.



On a separate note, if there are any outstanding issues in respect of the recent water penetration problems then please let me know and I will ensure that they are addressed as a matter of urgency.

Kind regards,  
**Daniel Wood**  
Assistant Director, Home Ownership  
t: [REDACTED] m: [REDACTED]



w: [www.kctmo.org.uk](http://www.kctmo.org.uk)  
a: 292a Kensal Road, London, W10 5BE

---

This e-mail message has been scanned for Viruses and Content and cleared by **MailMarshal**

---

**DISCLAIMER:**

This E-mail and any files transmitted with are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the System Administrator. This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this email. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Kensington & Chelsea TMO Ltd. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Kensington & Chelsea TMO Ltd accepts no liability for any damage caused by any Virus transmitted by this email.

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

From: [dwood@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:dwood@kctmo.org.uk)  
To: [REDACTED]  
CC: [rblack@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:rblack@kctmo.org.uk); [derek.myers@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:derek.myers@rbkc.gov.uk); [leader@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:leader@rbkc.gov.uk); [maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk](mailto:maria.memoli@localgovernance.co.uk); [REDACTED]; [sjevans@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:sjevans@kctmo.org.uk); [staffordt@parliament.uk](mailto:staffordt@parliament.uk); [REDACTED]; [adairo@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:adairo@kctmo.org.uk); [laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:laura.johnson@rbkc.gov.uk); [REDACTED]; [Complaints@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:Complaints@kctmo.org.uk); [jane.trethewey@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:jane.trethewey@rbkc.gov.uk); [penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:penelope.tollitt@rbkc.gov.uk); [aparkes@kctmo.org.uk](mailto:aparkes@kctmo.org.uk); [peter.bradbury@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:peter.bradbury@rbkc.gov.uk); [cldr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:cldr.e.campbell@rbkc.gov.uk)  
Date: Tue, 13 Dec 2011 13:42:54 +0000  
Subject: RE: Lift Maintenance Agreement

Dear Mr Awoderu,

Thank you for your email, I have noted your comments and will ensure that you have a full response no later than 23<sup>rd</sup> December.

I trust this is of assistance and please let me know if there is anything else I can help with.

Kind regards,  
**Daniel Wood**  
Assistant Director, Home Ownership  
t: [REDACTED] m: [REDACTED]